UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/737,456	12/14/2000	Gregory Peter Davis	AUS920000777US1	1620

7590 08/25/2005

Intellectual Property Law Dept.
IBM Corporation
11400 Burnet Road, Zip 4054
Austin, TX 78758

EXAMINER	
SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2654	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/737,456	DAVIS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas E. Shortledge	2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 July 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,15-20 and 22-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13,15-20 and 22-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 December 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1, 7, 12, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 1, 7, 12 and 19 recite pseudo language characters graphically recognizable as both the first language and a second language having second language characters different from the first language characters. The applicant indicated four instances where support for the amendment was disclosed, however the examiner was unable to find support within those instances or anywhere else in the specification for the above amendment.

Response to Arguments

3. As to claims 1, 7, 12, and 19, applicant's arguments filed 07/12/2005 (Remarks, page 7) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicants argue that U.S. Patent (6,185,729) do not teach the generation of pseudo language characters recognizable in both a first language having first language characters and a second language having second language character different from the first language characters as amended in the claims, however, the examiner found the amendment to be new matter, as it was not disclosed within the specification, finding arguments pertaining to such an amendment to be not persuasive.

4. The applicants' arguments to claims 4, 10, 18, and 25 have been fully considered and answered within the updated claim rejections below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-13, 15-20, and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Watanabe et al. (6,185,729).

As to claims 1 and 7, Watanabe et al. teach:

An input device for generating first language character data wherein each language character is represented by a single byte (a keyboard available as an input device, input being a single byte language col. 9, lines 8-9, and col. 7, lines 46);

software for generating pseudo language character data wherein each pseudo language character is represented by a plurality of bytes, the pseudo language character data is graphically recognizable as both a first language having language characters and a second language having second language characters different from the first language characters in response to receiving said first language character data from said input device (for the input data, creating a multi byte locale for a single byte language, (col. 8, lines 5-6), recognizable as both being the first language and the multi byte pseudo language characters, having characters that are visual distinct (col. 8, lines 5-12). Watanabe et al. do not explicitly teach a second language having second language characters different from the first language characters, however, this limitations has been rejected as new matter within the above 112 1st paragraph rejection);

inputting said pseudo language characters into said application, and displaying said pseudo language characters (using multi byte English local, the developer can

immediately test for problems and correct the software before the software is released, col. 8, lines 45-49).

As to claims 2 and 8, Watanabe et al. teach said pseudo language characters are graphically similar to said first language characters so as to be recognizable in said stop of displaying (creating a multi byte locale for a single byte language, it is desirable to build in features which permit ready identification of errors, col. 8, lines 5-10).

As to claim 3, Watanabe et al. teach translating each of said first language characters into a corresponding pseudo language characters (creating a multi byte language that represents a single byte U.S. ASCII character, col. 7, lines 67, and col. 8, lines 1-3).

As to claim 4 and 10, Watanabe et al. teach providing a lookup table such that said first language characters can be used to reference said pseudo language characters (language tables for mapping the single byte characters into multi byte characters, col. 5, lines 51-55, and 60-63).

As to claims 5 and 9, Watanabe et al. teach the first language is comprised of U.S. English characters (a U.S. ASCII English locale, col 7, lines 54).

As to claims 6 and11, Watanabe et al. teach said inputting further comprises utilizing a keyboard (a keyboard is also available as an input, col. 9, lines 9-10).

As to claim 12, Watanabe et al. teach:

a method for testing multibyte character data in an application (testing of the multi-byte functionality of a program, col. 7, lines 55-57);

inputting single byte data in a first language having first language characters (keyboard for inputting a single language, the language having English characters, col. 9, line 8, col. 7, line 52-55);

translating said single byte data into a pseudo character represented by a plurality of bytes in a pseudo language graphically recognizable as both the fist language and a second language having second language characters different from the first language characters (for the input data, creating a multi byte locale for a single byte language, (col. 8, lines 5-6), recognizable as both being the first language and the multi byte pseudo language characters, having characters that are visual distinct (col. 8, lines 5-12). Watanabe et al. do not explicitly teach a second language having second language characters different from the first language characters, however, this limitations has been rejected as new matter within the above 112 1st paragraph rejection);

utilizing said pseudo character in said application (using the multibyte English locale to test for problems in the program, col. 8, lines 45-49).

As to claim 13, Watanabe et al. teach displaying said pseudo character using said application (display of multibyte character, col. 8, line 10).

As to claim 15, Watanabe et al. teach the first language comprises U.S. English (language is English, col. 8 lines 1-2).

As to claim 16, Watanabe et al. teach inputting a string of first language characters wherein each of said first language characters are representable with a single byte (first language is a single byte language, col. 7, lines 52-53).

As to claim 17, Watanabe et al. teach utilizing a keyboard for said step of inputting, (keyboard for input, col. 9, lines 9-10).

As to claim 18, Watanabe et al. teach providing a lookup table such that said first language characters can be used to reference said pseudo language characters (language tables for mapping the single byte characters into multi byte characters, col. 5, lines 51-55, and 60-63).

As to claim 19, Watanabe et al. teach:

a program storage device embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform a method for testing a multibyte character data in an application

(program information for controlling the computer to enable the computer to perform its testing and development function in accordance with the invention, (col. 9, lines 30-34).

inputting single byte data in a first language having first language characters (keyboard for inputting a single language, the language having English characters, col. 9, line 8, col. 7, line 52-55);

translating said single byte data into a pseudo character represented by a plurality of bytes in a pseudo language graphically recognizable as both the first language and a second language having second language characters different from the first language characters (for the input data, creating a multi byte locale for a single byte language, (col. 8, lines 5-6), recognizable as both being the first language and the multi byte pseudo language characters, having characters that are visual distinct (col. 8, lines 5-12). Watanabe et al. do not explicitly teach a second language having second language characters different from the first language characters, however, this limitations has been rejected as new matter within the above 112 1st paragraph rejection); and

utilizing said pseudo character in said application (using the multibyte English locale to test for problems in the program, col. 8, lines 45-49).

As to claim 20, Watanabe et al. teach displaying said pseudo character using said application (display of multibyte character, col. 8, line 10).

As to claim 22, Watanabe et al. teach the first language comprises U.S. English (language is English, col. 8 lines 1-2).

As to claim 23, Watanabe et al. teach inputting a string of first language characters wherein each of said first language characters are representable with a single byte (first language is a single byte language, col. 7, lines 52-53).

As to claim 24, Watanabe et al. teach utilizing a keyboard for said step of inputting, (keyboard for input, col. 9, lines 9-10).

As to claim 25, Watanabe et al. teach providing a lookup table such that said first language characters can be used to reference said pseudo language characters (language tables for mapping the single byte characters into multi byte characters, col. 5, lines 51-55, and 60-63).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas E. Shortledge whose telephone number is (571)272-7612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TS
8/15/05

VIJAY CHAWAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER